APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,769	09/21/2001	Steven Soria JR.	STL920000113US1	6311

7590   03/23/2005

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/960,769	SORIA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 March 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 March 2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 7, 2005.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the amendment, claims 1-43 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17 and

31 are independent claims.

Drawings

3.   The objection to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the reference sign 200 mentioned in the description

on page 5, line 23 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The objection to Claim 27 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation

"said first table" in line 2 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12-15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27-29, 31, 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42

remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinander (WO

99/08206).

Regarding independent claim 1, Sinander discloses a method for supporting

versioning of data, said method comprising the steps of:

- associating version numbers, each having a different value, with a data

  item (p.7, Table 1 – as demonstrated in the table, different version

  numbers are associated with data);

- storing a most recent version of said data item in a first table (p.2, lines

  36-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as

  demonstrated in the figures and cited text, the most recent version of data

  is stored in a "first" table);

- storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in a

  second table (p.2, lines 33-35; p.3, lines 16-25; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b,

  3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, other versions of data

  is stored in a "second" table); and

- determining the version of a stored data item based on said version number and a storage location of said stored data item (p.7, lines 25-35; p.8, lines 4-9, 15-25; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, the version is determined based on version number and location).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- the step of associating said version number with a version of said stored data item (p.7, Table 1, lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, the version number is associated with data).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- said version number having a value of zero (0) is associated with said most recent version of said stored data item or an oldest version of said stored data item, depending on a context of use for said version number (p.7, Table 1, lines 23-35; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in the table and cited text, a value of zero is associated with the oldest version of data).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- the step of performing an operation on said first and said second table
  (p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in the cited text, an operation is
  performed on the tables).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Sinander discloses the method of claim 9,
wherein:

- said operation including said version number having a value of zero (0) is
  interpreted as a request for said most recent version of said stored data
  item, and said operation is selected from a group consisting of a query
  operation, a retrieve operation, and an update operation (p.2, lines 33-37;
  p.7, lines 25-28; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in the cited text,
  operation is an "update" operation and most recent version is requested).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1,
further comprising:

- a step of performing a query for said stored version for said data item (p.7,
  lines 25-35 – as demonstrated in the cited text, a "query" is performed on
  data).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1,
wherein:

- a first instance of a version of said data item is stored in said first table

  (p.4, lines 2-4; p.7, lines 23-35; figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the

  figures and cited text, a "first" version of the data is stored in a "first" table).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Sinander discloses the method of claim 1,

further comprising:

- the step of performing a query on said first table and said second table

  wherein a column attribute of a column selected by said query is retained

  in a result of said query (p.7, Table 1; p.8, lines 4-9 – as demonstrated in

  the table and cited text, a column attribute is retained as a result of

  "query").

Regarding dependent claim 15, Sinander discloses the method of claim 14,

wherein:

- said query invokes a union operation (p.3, lines 1-7, 16-25 – as

  demonstrated in the cited text, a "union" operation is invoked).

Regarding independent claim 17, Sinander discloses a system for supporting

versioning of data, said system comprising:

- a memory (Figure 1; p.4, lines 26-27 – as demonstrated in the figure and

  cited text, a memory is disclosed);

- means for associating version numbers, each having a different value, with a data item (p.7, Table 1 – as demonstrated in the table, different version numbers are associated with data);

- means for storing a most recent version of said data item in said memory and a second table for storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in said memory (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, the most recent version of data and another version of the data are stored); and

- means for determining the version of a stored data item based on said version number and a storage location of said stored data item (p.7, lines 25-35; p.8, lines 4-9, 15-25; Figures 2b, 3, 4 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, the version is determined based on version number and location).

Regarding dependent claims 18, 24, 25 and 27-29, the claims reflect the system with means for performing the operations of claims 2, 8, 10 and 13-15 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 31, 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42, the claims reflect the storage medium having computer readable instructions for performing the operations of claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 14 and 15 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

6.   Claims 3-6, 19-22 and 33-36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Sinander (WO 99/08206) in view of Frey et al. (U.S.

Patent 5410695).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Sinander does not disclose stored data item is

associated with a (version number - 1) value. Frey teaches an associated value

(col. 19, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Sinander and Frey before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include

associated values as taught by Frey, because associating a value with stored

data would increase the probability of the correct version being retrieved since

the value could be checked during a query along with the version number.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Sinander does not disclose the version of said

stored data item is determined based on said (version number - 1) value. Frey

teaches a value and version number being associated (col. 19, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Frey before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include associated values and version numbers as taught by Frey, because associating a value with stored data would increase the probability of the correct version being retrieved since the value could be checked during a query along with the version number.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Sinander does not disclose the step of generating a value for said (version number -1) value by incrementing said (version number - 1) value from zero (0) to n. Frey teaches incrementing a value (col. 19, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Frey before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include incrementing a value as taught by Frey, because associating a value with stored data would increase the probability of the correct version being retrieved since the value could be checked during a query along with the version number.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Sinander does not disclose the step of generating a value for said version number by incrementing said version number from zero (0) to m. Frey teaches incrementing a version number (col. 19, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Frey before him at the time the invention was made,

to modify the method taught by Sinander to include incrementing a version

number as taught by Frey, because associating a value with stored data would

increase the probability of the correct version being retrieved since the value

could be checked during a query along with the version number.

Regarding dependent claims 19-22 and 33-36, the claims reflect the system

and storage medium for performing the method of claims 3-6 and are rejected

along the same rationale.

7.   Claims 7, 23 and 37 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sinander (WO 99/08206) in view of Frey et al. (U.S. Patent

5410695) in further view of Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent 6591342).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Sinander does not disclose m has a

predetermined maximum value. Akkary teaches a predetermined maximum

value (col. 12, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Akkary before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include a

predetermined maximum value as taught by Akkary, because incrementing to a

predetermined maximum value would ensure that storage does not fill if the

maximum value were associated with the storage capacity so that new versions

could be saved. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to

utilize such combination because using a predetermined maximum number

would allow older versions that were obsolete to be removed from storage so that
new versions could be saved in the freed space.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 37, the claims reflect the system and
storage medium for performing the method of claim 7 and are rejected along the
same rationale.

8.   Claims 11, 26 and 40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Sinander (WO 99/08206) in view of Duvillier et al. (U.S. Pub.
No. 20020103815).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Sinander discloses said operation including
said version number having a value of zero (0) is interpreted as a request for an
oldest version of said stored data item (p.7, lines 25-35).

        Sinander does not disclose a delete operation. Duvillier teaches a delete
operation (p.6, para. 79). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art, having the teachings of Sinander and Duvillier before him at the time the
invention was made, to modify the method taught by Sinander to include a delete
operation as taught by Duvillier, because deleting older versions of data would
ensure that storage does not fill to capacity so new versions could be saved. It
would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such
combination because allowing older, obsolete versions to be removed from
storage would free space for new versions to be saved.

Regarding dependent claims 26 and 40, the claims reflect the system and

storage medium for performing the method of claim 11 and are rejected along the

same rationale.

9.   Claims 16, 30 and 43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sinander (WO 99/08206) in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Pub.

No. 20020073089).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Sinander does not disclose column attribute is

obtained from a sequential query language description area of said query result.

Schwartz teaches SQL obtains column attributes (p.6, para. 71). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sinander

and Schwartz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the

method taught by Sinander to include SQL obtaining column attributes as taught

by Schwartz, because SQL was well-known at the time of the invention for

querying and using a well-known language would have allowed more users to

utilize the invention since there was a familiarity with SQL.

Regarding dependent claims 30 and 43, the claims reflect the system and

storage medium for performing the method of claim 16 and are rejected along the

same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed March 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Applicants indicate Sinander fails to disclose that different versions of a data item are stored in different tables and a method for supporting versioning of data that includes "storing a most recent version of said data item in a first table [and] storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in a second table" (p.11, line 27; p.12, lines 1-4). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in a first table and storing a version other than the most recent version in a second table. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in the database, which is a table, and storing other versions in the new table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

        Claims 2, 8-10 and 12-15 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore claims 2, 8-10 and 12-15 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

        Regarding claim 17, Applicants indicate Sinander fails to disclose that different versions of a database component are stored in distinct tables and a system for supporting versioning of data that includes "means for storing a most recent version of said data item in said memory and a second table for storing a

version of said data item other than said most recent version in said memory"

(p.12, lines 20-24). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a

most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for storing a

version other than the most recent version. In other words, Sinander teaches

storing a most recent version in memory and storing other versions in the new,

second, table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14;

p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Claims 18, 24, 25 and 27-29 depend from independent claim 17.

Therefore claims 18, 24, 25 and 27-29 are rejected at least based on the

rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 31 includes recitals similar to claim 1. Therefore claim 31 is

rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42 depend from independent claim 31.

Therefore claims 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected at least based on the

rationale of the rejection above.

Claims 3-6, 19-22 and 33-36 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and

31. Therefore claims 3-6, 19-22 and 33-36 are rejected at least based on the

rationale of the rejections above.

Regarding claims 3-6, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander nor Frey disclose a method for supporting versioning of data including storing a most recent version of the data item in a first table and storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in a second table...failing to disclose all of the elements of claim 1 and claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 so for the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, claims 3-6 are patentable over Sinander and Frey (p.14, lines 5-13). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in a first table and storing a version other than the most recent version in a second table. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in the database, which is a table, and storing other versions in the new table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Regarding claims 19-22, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander nor Frey disclose a system for supporting versioning of data including means for storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in the memory...failing to disclose all of the elements of claim 17 and claims 19-22 depend from claim 17 so for the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 17, claims 19-22 are patentable over Sinander and Frey (p.14, lines 18-25). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version other than the most recent version. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most

recent version in memory and storing other versions in the new, second, table

(p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9;

Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Claims 7, 23 and 37 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 31.

Therefore claims 7, 23 and 37 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the

rejections above.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander, Frey nor

Akkary disclose a method for supporting versioning of data including storing a

most recent version of the data item in a first table and storing a version of said

data item other than said most recent version in a second table…failing to

disclose all of the elements of claim 1 and claim 7 depends from claim 1 so for

the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, claim 7 is patentable

over Sinander, Frey and Akkary (p.16, lines 3-10). The Examiner disagrees

because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in a first

table and storing a version other than the most recent version in a second table.

In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in the database,

which is a table, and storing other versions in the new table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3,

lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Regarding claim 23, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander, Frey nor

Akkary disclose a system for supporting versioning of data including means for

storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for

storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in the

memory...failing to disclose all of the elements of claim 17 and claim 23 depends

from claim 17 so for the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 17,

claim 23 is patentable over Sinander, Frey and Akkary (p.14, lines 15-23). The

Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of

a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version other than the

most recent version. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent

version in memory and storing other versions in the new, second, table (p.2, lines

33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b,

3, 4).

Claims 11, 26 and 40 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 31.

Therefore claims 11, 26 and 40 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the

rejections above.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander nor Duvillier

disclose a method for supporting versioning of data including storing a most

recent version of the data item in a first table and storing a version of said data

item other than said most recent version in a second table...failing to disclose all

of the elements of claim 1 and claim 11 depends from claim 1 so for the

reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, claim 11 is patentable

over Sinander and Duvillier (p.18, lines 2-10). The Examiner disagrees because

Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in a first table and storing a version other than the most recent version in a second table. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in the database, which is a table, and storing other versions in the new table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Regarding claim 26, Applicants indicate that neither Sinander nor Duvillier disclose a system for supporting versioning of data including means for storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in the memory...failing to disclose all of the elements of claim 17 and claim 26 depends from claim 17 so for the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 17, claim 26 is patentable over Sinander and Duvillier (p.14, lines 15-23). The Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version other than the most recent version. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in memory and storing other versions in the new, second, table (p.2, lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b, 3, 4).

Claims 16, 30 and 43 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 31. Therefore claims 16, 30 and 43 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Regarding claim 16, Applicants indicate that both Sinander and Schwartz

fail to disclose a method for supporting versioning of data including storing a

most recent version of the data item in a first table and storing a version of said

data item other than said most recent version in a second table...failing to

disclose all of the elements of claim 1 and claim 16 depends from claim 1 so for

the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, claim 16 is patentable

over Sinander and Duvillier (p.19, line 24; p.20, lines 1-5). The Examiner

disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of a data item

in a first table and storing a version other than the most recent version in a

second table. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent version in

the database, which is a table, and storing other versions in the new table (p.2,

lines 33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures

2b, 3, 4).

Regarding claim 30, Applicants indicate that both Sinander and Schwartz

fail to disclose a system for supporting versioning of data including means for

storing a most recent version of a data item in memory and a second table for

storing a version of said data item other than said most recent version in the

memory...failing to disclose all of the elements of claim 17 and claim 30 depends

from claim 17 so for the reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 17,

claim 30 is patentable over Sinander and Duvillier (p.20, lines 13-21). The

Examiner disagrees because Sinander teaches storing a most recent version of

a data item in memory and a second table for storing a version other than the

most recent version. In other words, Sinander teaches storing a most recent

version in memory and storing other versions in the new, second, table (p.2, lines

33-37; p.3, lines 16-25; p.4, lines 2-4; p.5, lines 9-14; p.8, lines 4-9; Figures 2b,

3, 4).

Conclusion

11.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Intelligent page store for concurrent and consistent access to a database by a transaction processor and a query processor (U.S. Patent 5317731),

- Building indexes on columns containing large objects (U.S. Patent 6243718),

- Systems and methods for backing up data files (U.S. Patent 6779003),

- Method and apparatus for simplified research of multiple dynamic databases (U.S. Pub. No. 20020091907),

- System for software update in manner based on processing properties of devices via maintenance network while allowing data transmission between devices on another network (U.S. Patent 5859977).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER